

**CLARK COUNTY
CLEAN WATER COMMISSION
Meeting Notes**

Wednesday, September 7, 2005
6:30 – 8:30 P.M.
Public Works Operations Conference Room
4700 NE 78th Street

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Present

Robert Agard, Tim Crawford, Anne Jackson, Bill Owen, Patty Page, Susan Rasmussen, Art Stubbs, Virginia van Breemen, Ronald Wilson

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Absent

Clark County Public Works Staff

Trista Kobluskie, Earl Rowell, Jim Soli, Cindy Stienbarger, Rod Swanson

Public

Robert Even, Alex Zimmerman

Call to Order

Introduction

The members of the Clark County Clean Water Commission, the public, and Clark County staff were introduced. The meeting was then called to order.

Mr. Stubbs presented Mr. Agard with a certificate of appreciation for his service on the Clean Water Commission.

Agenda and material review

The packet includes:

1. 09/07/05 Clean Water Commission Meeting Agenda
2. 08/03/05 Clean Water Commission Meeting Notes
3. Letter of appreciation to Commissioner Agard from the Board of Clark County Commissioners
4. Memorandum from Water Resources staff answering several of Mr. Agard's concerns
5. Memorandum from Jeff Schnabel answering several of Mr. McConathy's concerns
6. Clean Water Program Accomplishments (Capital Projects) as of 9/1/05
7. Clean Water Program Budget as of 7/1/05
8. Water Resources Section Project / Activity Reports
 - a. Stormwater Capital Improvement projects
 - b. Water Quality Monitoring and Evaluation projects
 - c. Public Education and Outreach projects
 - d. Regulations and Enforcement, and Operations and Maintenance projects
 - e. Administration and Coordination
9. Clean Water Program Projects / Activity spreadsheet
10. NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit Update



Meeting Notes

Communications with the Public

Mr. Rowell summarized communication by Water Resources staff with a citizen complaining about his Clean Water Program 2005 Service Fee. Mr. Stubbs then read a letter from Mr. Rowell addressed to the citizen, Mr. Nichols, in response to the citizen's concerns. In the letter, Mr. Rowell urges the citizen to attend Clean Water Commission meetings.

08/03/2005 Clean Water Commission Meeting Notes

Mr. Owen requested to strike "and himself" from the motion to form the Education Subcommittee on page five.

Mrs. Rasmussen asked to append information about Ms. van Breemen's environmental activities, including participation in the Watershed Stewards program, completion of the Living on the Land course, and habitat reconstruction on her own property, to "Ms. van Breemen indicated that she considers herself an environmental advocate" on page two.

The 08/03/2005 meeting notes were approved as revised.

Public Comments

None.

New Business

Public Education and Outreach

Mr. Rowell directed the audience to the August 2005 meeting packet, items 8-9. Mrs. Stienbarger circulated a summary of each major Outreach & Education activity.

Mrs. Stienbarger reviewed the following aspects of the Small Acreage Program:

- Costs
 - Division of funding between the county, WSU Extension, and Clark Conservation District
 - The Clark County portion of the Living on the Land series is \$48,500 this year
- The 12-week Living on the Land course
 - The amount of water quality protection and stormwater pollution control information given in the course
 - Described the educational materials given to participants, including a CD-ROM presentation
 - Next year, the Living on the Land series will be given only one time
- An upcoming pilot project targeting 4-H Club members
 - Will use educational materials formulated by Snohomish County
 - Will focus at first on horse owners



- Will develop a special award, such as a Clean Water Commission Award, for which participants can compete at the Clark County Fair
- The Clean Water Program Recognition for Small Acreages project
 - Showed the “Doing Our Part for Clean Water” sign that small landowners can qualify to display by taking steps to reduce stormwater pollution on their properties
 - 15 landowners have qualified for the sign
 - 10 landowners have displayed the sign
- General outreach to owners of small acreages
 - Series of articles on clean water in *Flying Changes*, a regional sport horse magazine

The group discussed an appropriate method for evaluating the cost of an education and outreach program.

Mr. Agard stated that figuring the dollars spent per participant would provide a gauge to judging effectiveness over time. Mrs. Stienbarger stated that the intangible benefits and indirect outreach resulting from direct contacts are impossible to count in such a formula. Mr. Agard indicated that the measure would be valid in terms of comparing the cost-effectiveness of a program’s performance over time (rather than as a way to compare programs to each other). Mrs. Stienbarger explained that costs such as printing costs of flyers that are distributed at events and reach many more people than the actual “participants” in a program cannot be measured in the cost/participant formula.

Mrs. Stienbarger stated that the budget increases in both the Watershed Stewards program and the Small Acreage Program have been small and due mostly to increased costs of staffing, such as health care increases. She stated that 15-20 people are trained per session in Watershed Stewards and that current number of active Watershed Stewards volunteers is 85-90.

Mr. Agard stated that fewer people participate per year in the Living on the Land series now than previously. Mr. Stubbs stated that a final figure of “participants” per program would include much more than class participants and actual Watershed Stewards. Mr. Stubbs stated that he wants to know the total number of people participating in or contacted by all of the water resources education programs together for each year.

Ms. Page asked if the outcomes, such as the work the Watershed Stewards do, are contained in any of the reports provided to the Commission.

Mr. Zimmerman is a Watershed Steward and is a trainer for the Living on the Land series. He stated that quantifying the number of people he reaches or the number of hours he puts in is impossible. Mr. Zimmerman suggested strongly to the Commission that Clean Water Program education and outreach staff attend the “Nonpoint Source and Stormwater Pollution Education Programs” conference in Chicago next month.

Mr. Stubbs explained that the Commission is not questioning the quality of the Clean Water Program education programs. Mr. Agard stated that some programs may need to end when they are no longer effective as evidenced by dwindling numbers of participants.

Mr. Agard requested that the budget figures be included in each quarterly and annual report presented to the Commission. Mrs. Stienbarger explained that the budget figures are contained in the Scope of Work for each project or program but would be easy to include in the annual reports.



Mr. Owen asked if the county's share of costs for the Small Acreage Program is fair to the county. Mrs. Stienbarger responded affirmatively.

Mr. Owen asked if potential education programs are compared against a series of standard criteria when the Education and Outreach program budgets are created. Mrs. Stienbarger stated that she is working on a draft of an Outreach and Education plan to present to the Education Subcommittee that identifies different audiences and messages. In the future, the plan will be used as a guide to program planning and budgeting. Mrs. Stienbarger stated that evaluations are currently being done on a per program basis.

Mrs. Stienbarger indicated that she thinks the Outreach and Education program needs an overall annual report.

Mr. Agard stated that he is concerned that urban citizens are not receiving the same targeted education as the rural citizens. Mrs. Stienbarger responded that Watershed Stewards is not aimed solely at rural citizens. Other education programs equally target rural and urban, such as the education billboards, the "Is Your Lawn Chemical-Free" ad campaign, and the Rain Garden workshops.

Mrs. Stienbarger reviewed the River Heroes presentation, which reached K-6 students in 22 schools, for 46 performances, and more than 12,500 students and 544 teachers this year.

NPDES Permit Update

Mr. Swanson reviewed the history of the Phase I National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems permit from the Washington State Department of Ecology in Clark County. In the late 1990's the federal Clean Water Act was amended to include the Phase II NPDES rules, which mandates that smaller municipalities in designated urban areas, such as Camas, Washougal, Vancouver and Battle Ground begin stormwater management activities. Preliminary review drafts of the new Phase I and Phase II NPDES permits were published by the Department of Ecology in May of 2005. The final permits will be issued next year and permittees must begin following the rules of the new permit 30 days after issuance.

The new permit will differ from the first permit because it will be prescriptive rather than asking the permittee to develop and implement a program tailored to their needs and resources. Mr. Swanson discussed some other likely differences, such as more coordination between permittees, and more stringent stormwater BMPs for development.

The group discussed whether the permit will address the issue of controlled wetlands. That issue is not dealt with in the NPDES permit.

Mr. Swanson explained that the permit will require the county to compare its current practices with the new standards and newest science.

Mrs. Rasmussen asked if Clark County critical areas and wetlands would be included in the new permit. Mr. Swanson explained that the critical areas are governed by a different area of state law that is separate from the Clean Water Act. However, in some cases, the designation of a critical area or a wetland might affect the design of a stormwater facility.

Mr. Swanson indicated that Ecology and the science of stormwater management recognize that the stormwater management activities might fall outside of the permit, in areas such as the use of basin plans,



buying forest and retaining it, and other methods that would not normally be considered stormwater management.

Mrs. Rasmussen asked if the new permit will require activities that the county has previously not funded. Mr. Swanson replied in the affirmative.

Capital Improvements Subcommittee Update

Mr. Crawford stated that the subcommittee is finalizing the requirements now, and in the next meeting they will weight each requirement.

Other Items

Mr. Rowell stated that items 8 & 9 in the packet will be discussed at next month's meeting. At the November meeting, staff from the Department of Community Development will give an update of their NPDES activities.

Mr. Soli discussed the reasons for not continuing the Cougar Creek Phase II project, which include lower-than-expected infiltration rates.

Mr. Soli stated that he would explain the Curtin Creek project at another meeting. Mr. Agard asked if the Clean Water Commission had evaluated the Curtin Creek project. Mr. Rowell stated that the Commission had evaluated the project several years ago, when it had been named the Schuller Project. Mr. Owen asked why the costs rose from \$1.6 million to \$3.5 million. Mr. Rowell stated that initially the Clean Water Program was trying only to buy capacity in the facility, whereas now the program is planning to buy the land and construct the facility. It will be a regional facility to which new developments in the area will discharge stormwater.

Ms. Page asked why two Capital Improvement Projects that were approved turned out later to be unfeasible. Mr. Rowell stated that the Commission reviewed projects of opportunity that later turned out to be technically unfeasible. Ms. Jackson asked if we would test the soils prior to trying similar projects in other areas. Mr. Rowell responded that tests would be done. Ms. Page asked if a simple percolation test would have indicated that the project would fail. Mr. Soli indicated that in the Phase I project, tests indicated that the soils had good percolation.

Mr. Stubbs requested an update on stream health for the November meeting. Mr. Rowell stated that he would ask Mr. Swanson.

Mr. Owen requested an update or a statement from Joel Rupley on progress of the LID letter.

Mr. Owen requested that staff bring the large watershed maps to the Clean Water Commission meetings.

The group discussed the location of the next meeting, at Fire Station 11 in Battle Ground.

Mrs. Rasmussen indicated that she thinks the kinds of questions posed to Mrs. Stienbarger during the meeting are very important issues for the Commission to discuss. Mrs. Rasmussen requested that a committee help Mrs. Stienbarger come up with an evaluation process for the education programs.

Adjourn



The meeting adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Clean Water Commission will be held on Wednesday, October 5, 2005 from 6:30 P.M. – 8:30 P.M. The location is Clark County Fire District #11 Meeting Room at 21609 NE 72nd Ave., Battle Ground.

Respectfully Submitted,
Trista Kobluskie

Q:\Admin\11151 CWC\2005 meeting notes\090705 CWC Meeting Notes.doc

